#### MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECIS PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION Type of Requestor: (x) Health Care Provider () Injured Employee ( ) Insurance Carrier Requestor's Name and Address MDR Tracking No.: Surgical and Diagnostic Center, LP M4-05-1359-01 729 Bedford Euless Road West, Suite 100 TWCC No.: Hurst, Texas 76053 Injured Employee's Name: Respondent's Name and Address Date of Injury: Royal Insurance Company of the America C/o Cunningham Lindsey US, Inc. Employer's Name: Box 11 Insurance Carrier's No.: PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service				0.
From	То	CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
11/25/03	11/25/03	81.83—Arthroscopy, Shoulder	\$5,477.35	
11/25/03	11/25/03	80008, 82947, 86701, 93005,		\$0.00
PT III. DEOUE	TOR'S POSITION S	93010 Lab Face	\$185.01	\$0.00

### PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Our charges are fair and reasonable based on other insurance companies determination of fair and reasonable payments of 85-100% of our billed charges. Workers' Compensation Carriers are subject to a duty of good faith dealing in the process of workers' compensation claims.

## PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

No response received.

# PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to services provided in an Ambulatory Surgical Center that are not covered under a fee guideline for this date of service. Accordingly, the reimbursement determined through this dispute resolution process must reflect a fair and reasonable rate as directed by Commission Rule 134.1. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it appears that neither the requestor nor the respondent provided convincing documentation that sufficiently discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that their purported amount is a fair and reasonable reimbursement (Rule 133.307). The failure to provide persuasive information that supports their proposed amounts makes rendering a decision difficult. After reviewing the services, the charges, and both parties' positions, it is determined that no other payment is due.

During the rule development process for facility guidelines, the Commission had contracted with Ingenix, a professional firm specializing in actuarial and health care information services, in order to secure data and information on reimbursement ranges for these types of services. The results of this analysis resulted in a recommended range for reimbursement for workers' compensation services provided in these facilities. In addition, we received information from both ASCs and insurance carriers in the recent rule revision process. While not controlling, we considered this information in order to find data related to commercial market payments for these services. This information provides a very good benchmark for determining the "fair and reasonable" reimbursement amount for the

To determine the amount due for this particular dispute, staff compared the procedures in this case to the amounts that would be within the reimbursement range recommended by the Ingenix study (from 192.6% TO 256.3% of Medicare for this particular year). Staff considered the other information submitted by the parties and the issues related to the specific procedures performed in this dispute. Based on this review, the original reimbursement on these services is within the medium to high end of the Ingenix range. According to he CMS/ASC guidelines, lab fees are included in the facility fees and not separately payable. The decision for no additional eimbursement was then presented to a staff team with health care provider billing and insurance adjusting experience. This team onsidered the decision and discussed the facts of the individual case.

		and the second s	
Based on the facts of this situation, the parties' experienced staff members in Medical Review,			
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION			
Dagad upon the review of the disputed l	agaithear garriage the Mad	ical Daview Divisi	ion has determined that the
Based upon the review of the disputed he requestor is <b>not</b> entitled to additional re	•	icai Review Divisi	ion has determined that the
findings and Decision by:			
Oelya Hausemfluck Authorized Signature	Debra Hausenfluck		August 17, 2005
Authorized Signature	Typed Name		Date of Decision
PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HE	ARING		
If you are unhappy with all or part of this decision were issued during the month of August 2005, so House Bill 7, recently enacted by the 79th Texas bending for a hearing at the State Office of Admitted articles during this transition phase. If you wish to have your request for a hearing to the Committed to SOAH for docketing. A request for a request to SOAH for docketing. A request for a request to S12-80 regioning September 1, 2005, appeals of medic County [see Texas Labor Code, Sec. 413.031(kapped a part of the county and the county for the decision of the county for t	should be aware of changes to the as Legislature, provides that an apprininistrative Hearings (SOAH) on a low to appeal to SOAH, found in a to seek an appeal of this medical ission as early as possible to allow a SOAH hearing should be sent to 04-4011. A copy of this Decision cal dispute resolution orders are producted as a search and effective Sept. Excision that is the subject of the approximation of the series of th	peal of a medical disputer before August 31, 2 Commission Rule 148 dispute resolution order sufficient time for the Chief Clerk of Processhould be attached to recedurally made directly, 2005). An appeal to peal is final and appear	that take effect September 1, 2005.  In take effect September 1, 2005.  In the resolution order that is not that i
ART-VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVER	RY CERTIFICATION	e e menter in	glanding the increase of the same of the second
hereby verify that I received a copy of this	Decision in the Austin Represe	entative's box.	
Signature of Insurance Carrier:	W. China	Date:	06-16-02